

### REMARKS

Claims 1-4, 6-8, 13 and 15-38 are pending with claims 1-4 and 19-21 being independent. Claims 1-4, 6, 13, 19-21 and 25-38 have been amended. Support for the amendments may be found in the application at, for example, page 10, line 25 to page 13, line 7 and FIG. 1. No new matter has been introduced.

#### ***Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 112***

Claims 1-4, 6-8, 13 and 15-38 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. Independent claims 1-4 and 19-21 have been amended to recite a single electroluminescent layer to address this rejection. Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection in view of these amendments.

#### ***Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102***

Claims 1, 8, 19, 22, 25 and 29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Korean Patent Publication Number 2002-094423 A (“Kim”).

As amended, claim 1 recites that “the first transistor is electrically connected to the first light emitting element, and... the second transistor is electrically connected to the second light emitting element.” Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 because Kim fails to disclose or suggest that such an arrangement.

Kim relates to an organic electroluminescence panel for two sided display, folder type mobile device. Kim at Abstract. FIG. 2 of Kim shows a pixel configuration of such an organic electroluminescence panel. As shown, the pixel includes a first electrode (12) and a second electrode (14) and an organic light-emitting layer (13) disposed between the first and second electrodes (12 and 14). Kim does not show a first transistor electrically connected to a first light emitting element and a second transistor electrically connected to a second light emitting element, as recited in claim 1. For at least these reasons, applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 along with its dependent claims.

Independent claim 19 has been amended to include features similar to the above-recited features of claim 1. Therefore, for at least the reasons presented above with respect to claim 1,

applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 19 along with its dependent claims.

### ***Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103***

Claims 2, 6, 16, 26, 32, 33 and 36 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Kim in view of U.S. Patent Publication Number 2003/0063243 (“Roosendaal”). Like claim 1, claim 2 has been amended to recite first and second transistors respectively connected to first and second light emitting elements. Like Kim, Roosendaal fails to describe or suggest such an arrangement.

Roosendaal relates to “an apparatus comprising a display device having a flat display, provided with means for visualizing images in two planes located on opposite sides of the display.” Roosendaal at paragraph [001]. Roosendaal provides a few example of such an apparatus. For example, Roosendaal, in FIGS. 1A-1B and 2A-2B, illustrates a laptop computer and a mobile telephone, respectively, each including a display device that seems to enable viewing from both sides of the display. Although Roosendaal may show a display device suitable for viewing from two sides, Roosendaal does not show the arrangement recited in claim 1. In particular, Roosendaal does not show that a first transistor electrically connected to a first light emitting element and a second transistor electrically connected to a second light emitting element, as recited in claim 2.

Accordingly, Kim and Roosendaal, either alone or in combination, fail to describe or suggest that “the first transistor is electrically connected to the first light emitting element, and the second transistor is electrically connected to the second light emitting element,” as recited in claim 2. For at least these reasons, applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 2 along with its dependent claims.

### ***Conclusion***

It is believed that all of the pending issues have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims)

Applicant : Jun Koyama et al.  
Serial No. : 10/719,031  
Filed : November 24, 2003  
Page : 13 of 13

Attorney's Docket No.: 12732-177001 / US6764


that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this reply should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this reply, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

No fee is believed to be due at this time. Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

4/30/07

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
John F. Hayden  
Reg. No. 37,640

Fish & Richardson P.C.  
1425 K Street, N.W.  
11th Floor  
Washington, DC 20005-3500  
Telephone: (202) 783-5070  
Facsimile: (202) 783-2331

40415009.doc